

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search and careful evaluation of the pending Application. Claims 1, 21, and 27 are amended herein. New claim 31 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. This Amendment and Response is being filed together with a Request for Continued Examination.

The Rejections

Claims 21-22 and 27-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,740,361 to Brown (hereafter "Brown"). Claims 1-9 and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,493,722 to Daleen et al (hereafter "Daleen") further in view of USPN 6,023,684 to Pearson (hereafter "Pearson"). Claims 10-11 and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daleen, further in view of Pearson, further in view of USPN 5,857,191 of Blackwell, Jr. et al (hereafter "Blackwell"). Claims 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daleen, further in view of Pearson, further in view of USPN 5,758,324 to Hartman et al. (hereafter "Hartman"). Claims 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daleen, further in view of Pearson, further in view of Hartman, further in view of Blackwell. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daleen, further in view of Pearson, further in view of USPN 5,347,477 to Lee (hereafter "Lee"). Claims 23, 25 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, further in view of USPN 5,604,802 to Holloway (hereafter "Holloway"). Claims 24 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, further in view of Holloway, further in view of USPN 6,122,622 of Wiitala et al. (hereafter "Wiitala"). Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, further in view of Holloway, further in view of Hartman.

The Applicant maintains their previously presented position with regards to the claims as filed and understanding of the prior art. Accordingly, we will pursue such claims in a latter application. For the present, amendments have been made to the claims to clarify language in a manner that addresses concerns raised by the Examiner.

With regards to claim 1 and Daleen, the Examiner properly notes that Daleen states people "often think of a database as an electronic filing system." Daleen col. 4, lines 7 – 8. The nature of the "electronic filing system" that Daleen describes is merely the equivalent of paper filing cabinet, the act of filing in Daleen's context being simply placing a paper file or document into the filing cabinet. In contrast, the Applicant's claimed invention is related to a filing system of a different nature. To make this clear, claim 1 has been amended to require that "said electronic document [is] filed for further processing by a receiving agency in accordance with a procedure for which said receiving agency is in some manner responsible."

As to claims 21 and 27, the Examiner asserts that Brown teaches automatically filling in an electronic form. Specifically, the Examiner insists that Brown's acts of a) providing an electronic form, 2) allowing a user to manually enter a password, and 3) subsequently storing the password data are equivalent to automatically filling in an electronic form. The Applicant is unable to determine how such a sequence of events can equate to automatically filling in an electronic form. Claims 21 and 27 have been amended to clarify what the Applicant intends by automatically filling-in. Specifically, "data useful for populating an HTML based form" is stored prior to providing the HTML based form to the client. Once the form is presented, then "suitable data selected from said data useful for populating said HTML based form" is used to at least partially automatically populate the HTML based form.

The remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 21 and 27, and are patentable for at least the reasons stated above.

New claim 31 presents a specific application embodiment of the present invention and is neither taught nor reasonably suggested by the prior art.

Conclusion

For at least the forgoing reasons, Applicant believes that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the present application, the undersigned can be reached at (650) 838-4441.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: November 3, 2004

Brian R. Coleman
Reg. No. 39,145

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, CA 94026-2168
(650) 838-4300